

to the bottom of it and complies—and, yes, as soon as we have a special counsel, an independent counsel, not from the Justice Department but a special independent counsel needs to be appointed immediately to make sure that logs, records, and phone logs are not destroyed, that computer files are not erased, and to make sure that we find out who it was who did this to our intelligence communities. Nothing less than a special counsel with full investigative powers, with the full powers of subpoena, nothing less than that will suffice to clear this up and to assure the American people that the President and those close around him had nothing to do with this.

Mr. REID. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARKIN. I yield to my friend from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I haven't heard all of the Senator's statement, but what I have heard leads me to believe after having read about this myself that whoever did this is a traitor. Whoever leaked this is someone who has subjected someone who is an undercover spy for this country to being murdered. I think that it even puts the columnist at risk, Bob Novak, who I like very much. I don't always agree with his politics, but he is a person who has always been very good to me.

I am very happy that the Senator from Iowa has weighed in on this.

I also acknowledge that something should be done. It is my understanding that the majority and the Democratic leader, the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, the ranking member of the Defense Committee, and the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee have written a letter to the Attorney General and the President tonight calling for just what the Senator from Iowa has asked—that there be a special counsel selected to go into this. Some of the things that the special counsel went into during the last few years are minor compared to the gravity of this.

I personally applaud and congratulate the Senator from Iowa for bringing this to the attention of the people of America.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank my friend from Nevada. I am glad to hear that those individuals have sent a letter to the President and to the Attorney General. I hope our friends on the other side of the aisle will do the same. I hope the majority leader and the chairmen of those respective committees will do the same and ask for a special independent counsel.

The word "traitor" is not misleading. It is not trying to blow this out of proportion. I think the Senator is absolutely right. Whoever leaked this and put not only this agent at risk—think about all of the contacts this agent had in other countries. Think about the chilling effect this puts on our intelligence gathering to combat international terrorism. The word "traitor" is certainly not going beyond the bounds.

I think the Senator is right. This is not some obscure little thing. This is not some obscure real estate deal out in the middle of nowhere. This affects the security and safety of our country.

I don't know who did this. But they have to be punished.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for another brief comment?

We have had some espionage people who have turned on us in recent years. They have had very high publicity. I think of the man in Kansas who turned and became a double agent, so to speak, which led to the deaths of American operatives in other countries.

Is this any less than that? It is on the same plane. Whoever did that is certainly guilty of crimes—not punishable by death, perhaps, as Hanssen was subject to, but certainly punishable for many years in Federal prison. I appreciate the Senator bringing this to the attention of the American people through speaking in the Senate.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank my friend.

A CROSSROADS FOR U.S. ENERGY POLICY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last month a power blackout stranded millions of commuters and shut down businesses in the northeast and midwest. A few weeks later we saw the sharpest weekly increase ever in gasoline prices, just in time for Labor Day. And in Nevada, California and other western States, consumers are still smarting from energy market manipulation by Enron and other companies.

It is clear, as President Bush recently pointed out, that our Nation desperately needs an energy policy.

But not just any energy policy. It must be the right policy, one that protects consumers, safeguards our environment, and bolsters our national security.

That means we must ensure the reliability of our electricity markets, make a serious commitment to conserve energy, balance the interests of big oil companies against the interests of consumers, and kick our addiction to oil from the Middle East.

Unfortunately, some of the ideas that seem likely to emerge from the conference committee on the Energy bill would make matters worse, not better. Although the need for a new energy policy is urgent, we must not be stampeded down the wrong path.

The Environmental Protection Agency took a dangerous step in that direction just a few weeks after the August blackout, when it relaxed pollution rules for some electric power plants.

Allowing old plants to spew more pollution into our air is not the way to create a reliable supply of electricity. It is certainly not a good thing to spew this into the air for my children and my grandchildren. Instead, we must develop our abundant sources of clean, renewable energy: water, the wind, the sun, and the heat within the Earth.

These resources can provide steady, reliable power that is not subject to

wild market swings, protecting consumers from shortages and price spikes. Developing renewable energy also creates new jobs. And renewable energy is made in the USA, not subject to the whims of foreign powers.

I am proud that Nevada is a leader in developing our renewable resources. By 2013, the State of Nevada has committed to produce 15 percent of our electricity from renewable sources. State initiatives like this are important and good.

These State initiatives that require a certain percentage of electricity is generated from renewable energy is spurring the growth of geothermal power in Nevada, California and other western states.

Our Nation also needs to set an ambitious but attainable goal for developing renewable energy. Unfortunately, it appears that the conference committee will not include such a goal in the bill that will be offered for our consideration.

We not only need goals for renewable energy, we need incentives that will help us reach them.

Thanks to rapidly improving technology and tax incentives, development of wind power has exploded in the past several years.

I have introduced legislation to expand the production tax credit from wind to include geothermal and solar power. This bipartisan legislation, cosponsored by Senator SMITH of Oregon and 14 others, would also extend the tax credit so businesses could invest in renewable energy with more certainty.

If we are serious about an energy policy that helps consumers and our environment, these provisions must be included in any eventual agreement with the House.

Another bad idea that is being promoted as the panacea for our energy problems is nuclear power.

Nuclear power sounds okay until it is time to dispose of the dangerous radioactive waste. Then nobody wants the stuff anywhere near their community including those scientists who insist it is "safe."

As most of my colleagues are aware, Nevadans are fighting a plan to dump the Nation's nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain, about an hour away from the fastest-growing urban area in the country, Las Vegas. We want our State to be a proving ground for renewable energy, not a dumping ground for nuclear waste. That should also be the thrust of our national policy for producing more electricity.

When it comes to fueling our cars and trucks, we have to kick the Middle East oil habit. It compromises our national security and leaves consumers vulnerable to market manipulations by nations like Saudi Arabia, which contributed to the recent spike in U.S. gas prices by slashing exports.

Unfortunately, we can not drill our way to energy independence. The U.S. currently uses 25 percent of the petroleum produced in the world, yet we

hold only about 3 percent of the Earth's known reserves. We can not create more oil under the ground, and drilling in a pristine area like the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would do very little to boost total production.

There is a solution, however: We can do a better job of conserving oil, with stricter fuel standards for all vehicles, including popular SUVs. By reducing our dependence on foreign oil, conservation will make us more secure; it will also help consumers and the environment.

Some people suggest that fuel cell technology will allow us to convert our vehicles from petroleum to hydrogen, but that will not happen overnight. In the meantime we need a clean way to produce hydrogen fuel. Burning fossil fuels to make hydrogen will still pollute our air and increase global warming. Clean, renewable energy should be part of the hydrogen solution.

As we move into the 21st century, we face tremendous energy challenges, but we also have great opportunities.

We must reduce our dependence on foreign oil and make a bold commitment to clean, renewable energy.

I hope the members of the conference committee will keep these principles in mind as they work to prepare a bill for our consideration. Anything less would be a failure of vision and leadership.

STRENGTHENING CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the Senate has a special bipartisan tradition of support for child nutrition, and I am pleased to promote that tradition by joining with Senators ELIZABETH DOLE and PAT ROBERTS in cosponsoring S. 1549, which would expand children's access to the free school lunch and breakfast programs.

This idea was first suggested to me by Senators Bob Dole and George McGovern at a conference last year at Dakota Wesleyan College in Mitchell, SD. Since our conversation, I have heard from a number of schools in South Dakota that many families whose children qualify for a reduced price lunch find it difficult to pay even the reduced fee. For some families, the fee can actually be an insurmountable barrier to participation.

The main purpose of the school lunch program is to make sure that children have a reliable, nutritious lunch every day. If a lower income family can't afford to pay for a reduced price lunch, it follows that they will also struggle to afford to provide a bag lunch for their child.

S. 1549 has strong support within my State. The South Dakota State Board of Education and more than two dozen local school boards have passed resolutions urging Congress to eliminate the reduced price school meal program.

Expanding children's access to the free school lunch and breakfast programs would unquestionably help promote better child nutrition in America.

I have cosponsored S. 1529 because I support that goal.

I also support other equally important child nutrition and food program improvements. For example, lowering the area eligibility guideline in the summer and child care food programs from the current 50 percent to 40 percent would provide services to more children in low-income communities. Increasing children's access to fresh fruits and vegetables, whole grains, low-fat dairy products, and lean meats are important steps in improving overall health and reducing obesity. Reducing the paperwork burden for participants in the Summer Food Program would help make sure more children have access to healthy food when school is not in session. Making for-profit child care centers that serve low-income children eligible to participate in the Child and Adult Care Food program, and additional improvements to other nutrition programs, including food stamps, are long overdue.

Strengthening food support for low-income families is a sound investment in the long-term health and well-being of our children, and each of these initiatives is a worthy goal. Collectively, they are goals, I believe, a nation as great as the United States should strive to achieve. However, the current budgetary climate makes any of these investments extremely difficult.

Just 2 years ago, record budget surpluses were projected that could have been used to fund this priority. Today, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, CBO, projects massive deficits for many years to come, nearly 40 percent of which CBO attributes to the Bush tax cuts.

The President chose to make tax cuts his economic priority, effectively at the expense of investments in our children. The Republican budget resolution, adopted earlier this year, made the same choice. It prioritized additional tax cuts, while providing no additional resources to the Senate Agriculture Committee for child nutrition or other improvements to food programs.

Unless we can take steps to reorder the priorities in the federal budget, this means any costs resulting from improvements we might make in nutrition programs must be paid for by cutting the same programs or by increasing the deficit.

The administration has proposed to require schools to increase their efforts to verify participating families' incomes which would have the result of generating budget savings. Sound reasonable? But the Department of Agriculture just released results from several new studies that show increasing income verification does virtually nothing to reduce errors but will significantly diminish participation by eligible children. The burden would be particularly acute for small, rural schools, like many in my state, that do not have the personnel to handle the increased paperwork. We clearly should

not attempt to feed one group of children by forcing another group of eligible children out of the program.

I support harmonizing the school meal income guidelines with the WIC income guidelines, as S. 1549 proposes. Under current circumstances, this may take some time to achieve. I will continue to work with my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to explore how we might make improvements in our nutrition programs, including advancing the goal of S. 1549. I encourage my colleagues to take a serious look at S. 1549 and consider promoting this legislation as part of a comprehensive, long-term strategy to invest in important national nutritional priorities.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred in Islip Terrace, NY. On September 23, 2003, two brothers from Colombia were attacked by white students at East Islip High School. The incident, in which anti-Hispanic epithets were spoken, occurred in a hallway of the school. The victims, a junior and a senior, were treated at Southside Hospital for undisclosed injuries.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

DIABETES PREVENTION & TREATMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to be a sponsor with Senator COCHRAN of S. 1666, the Diabetes Prevention & Treatment Act of 2003.

Today, our health care system spends 1 out of every 4 Medicare dollars on diabetes. Almost 200,000 Americans die because of diabetes each year, and almost one-third of Americans alive today are not aware that they have the disease.

The tragedy is that with the simple preventive and treatment measures available today, we can dramatically improve the likelihood that patients will never develop type 2 diabetes, and we can give good care to those who have type 1 diabetes. With only 30 minutes of walking a day and a healthy diet, people can reduce their chance of developing type 2 diabetes by 58 percent.

Despite these innovations far too many citizens do not realize they are